



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/699,859

10/31/2003

Howard W. Lutnick

02-1078

5126

63710

7590

07/03/2008

DEAN P. ALDERUCCI

CANTOR FITZGERALD, L.P.

110 EAST 59TH STREET (6TH FLOOR)

NEW YORK, NY 10022

EXAMINER

ALI, HATEM M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3692

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

07/03/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<p align="center">Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief</p>	<p>Application No. 10/699,859</p>	<p>Applicant(s) LUTNICK ET AL.</p>	
	<p>Examiner HATEM ALI</p>	<p>Art Unit 3692</p>	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 19 June 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☐ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
Claim(s) allowed: _____.
Claim(s) objected to: _____.
Claim(s) rejected: _____.
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: see paper no. 20080510.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information *Disclosure Statement*(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____.
13. ☒ Other: See Continuation Sheet.

/Harish T Dass/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3692

Continuation of 13. Other:

In response to applicant's argument, "The Examiner is ... motiation to combine ... prima facie ... Finally, Applicants disagree with the Examiner's interpretation of the inherent disclosure of Fraser with regard to the non-benchmark issue aspects of claims 1-30", Examiner cited from Fraser(col.4, line 54+) " the objects of the present invention are realized in a specifically delineated computer-based data processing system having a governing program controlled logic for orchestrated management of select trading functionality. The data processing employs a plurality of trading workstations linked with a server for coordinated data flow and processing. ... a dedicated keypad for input from each workstation ... individually programmed keystroke commands: other keyboards or keypads ... often software configurable so as to be compliant with the present system" and also see Fig.3A, main key functions, four keys in each column can be programmed to match or complement issue keys, where total of 12 issue keys can be preset for the 6 keys as shown. This disclosure of Fraser implies with regard to the benchmark issues of claims 1-30.

In response to Applicant's argument about motivation, "Additionally, the Examiner has not provided any evidence of the stated motivation to combine Fraser and Silverman. As such, the examiner has failed to make a prima facie showing of obviousness" the Examiner finds the prior art (Silverman,Figs 1-9 and col.4, lines 11-20) contain a 'comparable' device (display device for ticker pages for buy or sell order transaction information same time that are not the same as the base device) that was improved in the same way as the claimed invention of display device to display simultaneously a first trading quadrant and a second trading quadrant. See page 5, line 14, paper # 20080510 on 5/22/08. This rationale support a conclusion that the claim would have been obvious that a method of enhancing a particular class of device was made part of the ordinary capabilities of one skilled in the art based upon the teaching of such improvement in other situations. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been capable of applying this known method of enhancement to a "base" device in the prior art and the results would have been predictable to one of ordinary skill in the art. ref 58. KSR, 550 U.S. at_, 82 USPQ2d at 1396. Moreover simultaneous display of ticker pages(Silverman-Abstract) is a cosmetic arrangement of windows